UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,506	01/17/2006	Frank K. Botz	M 6700A PCT/US	4080
423 HENKEL COR	7590 05/27/200 PORATION	9	EXAMINER	
1001 TROUT E	BROOK CROSSING		VASISTH, VISHAL V	
ROCKY HILL, CT 06067			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/541,506	BOTZ ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	VISHAL VASISTH	1797
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17. This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-61 are subject to restriction and/o	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according an applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the specific part of th	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	oate

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The requirement for restriction/election mailed on 4/13/2009 is withdrawn. Applicant filed a preliminary amendment on 7/8/2005 which corrected claim numbering issues and wherein claims were cancelled, therefore affecting the claims in each group discussed below.

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 8-11, 13, 15-23, 25-26 and 28-29, drawn to a process for hydroforming a tube of ductile solid material, classified in class 72, subclass 42.
 - II. Claim 30, drawn to a liquid film lubricant, classified in class 508, subclass 491.
 - III. Claims 38, 42, 45, 48-49, 51-53 and 56, drawn to a solid film lubricant, classified in class 508, subclass 451.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions Group I, Group II and Group III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the liquid film lubricant of Group II and the solid film lubricant of Group III have utility other than in the hydroforming process of Group I. They can be used in materially different processes such as a metal drawing or metal cutting

operation or in the lubrication of engine parts. Groups II and III are directed to compositions which are unrelated, i.e., the compositions comprising different components.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/541,506

Art Unit: 1797

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 4

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,506 Page 5

Art Unit: 1797

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VISHAL VASISTH whose telephone number is (571)270-3716. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8:30a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571)272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VVV

/Glenn A Caldarola/ Acting SPE of Art Unit 1797